

Serial No. 10/030,797
RCA89615

PATENT
Customer No. 24498

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Scott Edward Klopfenstein	Examiner:	Hung Q. Dang
Serial No.	10/030,797	Group Art Unit:	2621
Filed:	May 13, 2002	Docket No.	RCA89615
Title:	SYSTEM FOR PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION ERROR MANAGEMENT IN A VIDEO DECODER		
Customer No.:	24498		

**RESUBMISSION OF APPELLANT'S BRIEF WITH REQUEST FOR
CONTINUING EXAMINATION WITH AN IDS**

MAIL STOP: APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Commissioner for Patents

Post Office Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This brief being resubmitted to the Patent Office with a Notice of Appeal in connection with an IDS that is being submitted at the same type. The Appellants are filing an Request for Continuing Examination with this Appeal Brief and the Notice of Appeal, so the IDS can be considered by the USPTO in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97(b).

Please charge Deposit Account 07-0832 for the Request for Continuing Exam. Please also charge this Deposit Account \$30.00 additional for the Notice of Appeal that was previously paid for previously in 2008 and \$30.00 additional for the Appeal Brief that was previously paid for in 2008.

Applicant hereby appeals to the Board from the decision of the Examiner in the Office Action dated March 24, 2008 that rejected the pending claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 19-21. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 19-21 are now on appeal. The fee for the appeal brief filed on August 18, 2008 was already paid. No oral hearing is requested.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is Thomson Licensing Inc., the assignee of record.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 19-21, is set forth in Appendix A of this brief are rejected. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 19-21 are appealed in this brief.

Claims 5, 7, 10, 13-18 are canceled.

Specifically, the Examiner objected to claims 1 and 11, claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claims 2-3, 9, 11-12, 19, 20, and 21 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) in the Office Action dated March 24, 2008.

Appellant has filed an amendment prior to the filing of this Appeal Brief to address the formalities raised by the objections. Accordingly, this Appeal Brief is focused solely on the substantive rejections in the Office Action dated March 24, 2008.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An amendment has been filed on July 28, 2008 after the filing of the Notice of Appeal on June 16, 2008. The amendment was filed to comply with requirements of form expressly set forth in the Office Action dated March 24, 2008. Appellant requested that the amendment be entered so that the substantive arguments could be addressed during Appeal.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In one aspect, a process is claimed in Claim 1 for a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables. See Specification,

page 2, lines 11-23, (“[a] processing system decodes packetized program information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables.”) The ancillary information in Claim 1 is for use in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display. See Specification, page 2, lines 13-15, (“[t]he ancillary information is used in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display”). Further, the process detects a mismatch between a version number of a first table of said program specific information and a corresponding version number of the first table conveyed in a second table. See Specification, page 6, lines 14-18, (“ ... version numbers of program specific information tables are compared with corresponding version numbers conveyed in an MGT in order to detect a mismatch.”); Figure 3 (step 253). In addition, the process ensures compatibility of the first table version number conveyed in the first and second tables in response to the detected mismatch using a forced compatible version number. See Specification, page 6, lines 19-24, (“... in response to a detected mismatch (with or without the table re-acquisition of step 255), the VCT version number and the corresponding version number conveyed in an MGT are advantageously forced to be compatible.”); Figure 3 (step 257). The compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table. See Specification, page 6, lines 28-29, (“[t]his is done by substituting (or overwriting) the VCT version number conveyed in the MGT with the VCT version number conveyed in the VCT itself.”). The substitution example highlights the efficiency of establishing compatibility without having to acquire new information, i.e., reacquiring one of the tables, which results in delay. See Specification, page 4, line 40 to page 5,

lines 12, (“[h]owever, the version number incompatibility is resolved at the expense of incurring additional delay in re-acquiring the VCT.” Further, the process decodes packetized program information using program specific information including the first and second tables, at least one of the first and second tables including the forced compatible version number, to provide a video program for display. See Specification, page 2, lines 20-23, (“[t]he packetized program information is decoded to provide video program for display using the program specific information including the first and second tables including the forced compatible version number.”). The step of ensuring compatibility of the first table version number conveyed in the first and second tables includes at least one of the following steps. First, the step may be substituting a version number for the first table version number by substituting in the first table the first table number conveyed in the second table, to ensure compatibility. See Specification, page 6, lines 28-29, (“[t]his is done by substituting (or overwriting) the VCT version number conveyed in the MGT with the VCT version number conveyed in the VCT itself.”). Second, the step may be substituting the version number for the first table version by substituting in the second table the first table number conveyed in the first table, to ensure compatibility. See Specification, page 6, lines 29-31, (“[a]lternatively, this may be done by substituting (or overwriting) the VCT version number conveyed in the VCT with the VCT version number conveyed in the MGT.”) Third, the step may be reverting to a previous version of at least one of (a) the first table, and (b) the second table, to ensure version number compatibility. See Specification, page 6, lines 21-23, (“[i]n another embodiment, a previous version of the VCT or MGT providing version number compatibility may be used in response to a detected mismatch.”).

In Claim 9, a process is utilized in a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables. See Specification, page 2, lines 11-23, (“[a] processing system decodes packetized program information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables.”) The ancillary information is for use in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display. See Specification, page 2, lines 13-15, (“[t]he ancillary information is used in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display”). Further, the process detects a mismatch between a version number of a first table of the program specific information and a corresponding version number of the first table conveyed in a second table. See Specification, page 6, lines 14-18, (“ ... version numbers of program specific information tables are compared with corresponding version numbers conveyed in an MGT in order to detect a mismatch.”); Figure 3 (step 253). In addition, the process decodes packetized program information by disregarding the first table version number conveyed in the first and second tables in response to the detected mismatch. See Specification, page 7, lines 5-10, (“[i]n another embodiment, in step 257, the detected version number incompatibility may be disregarded and the VCT information used for channel acquisition even though there is a version number incompatibility.”). The process also decodes packetized program information by applying program specific information including information in the first table. See Specification, page 7, lines 5-10, (“[i]n another embodiment, in step 257, the detected version number incompatibility may be disregarded and the VCT information used for channel acquisition even though there is a version number incompatibility.”). Further,

the process examines the program specific information for an error condition in addition to the detected mismatch. See Specification, page 7, lines 7-10, (“[i] an alternative embodiment however, the version number incompatibility is only disregarded if there are no other error indications (as exemplified by those described in following step 260) of a disabling corruption of the VCT or MGT data.”). Finally, the process decodes the packetized program information in response to the absence of an error condition when the mismatch is the only detected error condition. See Specification, page 7, lines 23-29, (“In step 265, the decoding of the packetized program information is inhibited for those physical channels associated with a version number mismatch or other error condition as indicated by the database. Therefore, if version number compatibility is being forced or is being disregarded in step 257 and no error condition is detected in step 260, then packetized program information is decoded in step 265 to provide a video or audio program or reproduction on a display or audio device.”)

In Claim 19, a process is utilized in a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables. See Specification, page 2, lines 11-23, (“[a] processing system decodes packetized program information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables.”) The ancillary information in Claim 19 is used in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display. See Specification, page 2, lines 13-15, (“[t]he ancillary information is used in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display”). Further, the process detects a fault condition in program specific information comprising at least one of, (a) a version number incompatibility between a

version number of a first table and a corresponding version number of said first table conveyed in a second table, and (b) a PSI error condition. See Specification, page 6, lines 14-18, (“ ... version numbers of program specific information tables are compared with corresponding version numbers conveyed in an MGT in order to detect a mismatch.”); Figure 3 (step 253); Specification, page 7, lines 11-17, (“[t]he packetized program information is examined in step 260 for error indications.”); Figure 3 (step 260). In addition, the process indicates in a database said transmission channel is associated with said detected fault condition. See Specification, page 7, lines 17-19, (“[t]he detection of such an error condition, or of a table version number mismatch condition, occurring on a particular physical transmission channel, is recorded in a database in step 263.”); Figure 3 (step 263). Finally, the process removes a channel associated with said fault condition from a User’s viewable active channel line-up list. See Specification, page 7, lines 20-22, (“[t]he database is further used in step 270 to delete those channels associated with a version number mismatch or error condition from a User’s channel line-up.”); Figure 3 (step 270).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,763,552 to Kondo et al. (“Kondo”). In addition, claim 2 is rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of WO 99/03268 to Ozkan et al. (“Ozkan”). Further, claim 3 is rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,844,595 to Blatter et al. (“Blatter”). In addition, , claims 9 and 11-12 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of Blatter. Claim 19 is rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,617,565 to Augenbraun et al. (“Augenbraun”). Further, claim 20 is rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of

Augenbraun and Blatter. In addition, claim 21 is rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of Augenbraun and U.S. Patent No. 6,445,923 to Fujimori et al. (“Fujimori”).

VII. ARGUMENT

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4, 6, and 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kondo. However, as will be discussed, Kondo does not provide a teaching for these claims.

Substitution of Version Number or Reversion of Version

With respect to independent claim 1, compatibility of version numbers is forced if a mismatch is detected between (1) a version number of a first table appearing in the first table and (2) a version number of the first table appearing in the second table. The Specification explains that situations may occur where simply trying to reacquire one of the tables will be ineffective or inefficient.

A first situation arises when “[a] broadcaster may erroneously transmit and MGT and VCT that have incompatible version numbers, but that are in all other respects valid, for example.” See Specification, page 4. In other words, the broadcaster intended to send compatible tables, but made an error in documenting the versions in one of the tables. In such a situation, the Specification explains that simply attempting to reacquire one of the tables will not resolve the mismatch:

“If a broadcaster erroneously transmits an MGT and VCT that have incompatible version numbers, but that are in all other respects valid, the reacquisition of either the VCT or MGT does not resolve the incompatibility. This is because under these conditions the MGT will never match the VCT. This may potentially produce a failure mode involving continuous re-acquisition of a VCT or MGT”.
See Specification, page 4.

Simply trying to reacquire the table with same error or the correct table will not resolve the mismatch. Such a reacquisition effort may even lead to a continuous reacquisition that results in a failure mode.

A second situation arises when the following occurs:

“Alternatively, a version number mismatch may occur if, after an MGT is acquired, but before a VCT is acquired, program specific information tables are updated. The updated tables contain new version numbers and this results in the MGT conveying an older VCT version number than the version number of the acquired VCT.” See Specification, page 4.

The reacquisition of the VCT may successfully resolve the incompatibility in this second situation, but with the added inefficiency of having to reacquire the VCT:

“In contrast, if a version number mismatch occurs through the intervening update of program specific information tables occurring between the acquisition of an MGT and a VCT, the re-acquisition of the VCT successfully resolves the incompatibility. However, the version number incompatibility is resolved at the expense of incurring additional delay in re-acquiring the VCT.” See Specification, pages 4-5.

Accordingly, such a solution is inefficient.

Claim 1 provides efficient solutions that are both efficient and effective in resolving the mismatch described above. These solutions do **not require a re-acquisition of a table**. The first two solutions allow for a substitution of a **version number**. First, if there is a mismatch between a first version number in the first table and the second table, the first version number appearing in the second table can be substituted for the version number that appears in the first table. Second, if there is a mismatch between a first version number in the first table and the second table, the first version number appearing in the first table can be substituted for the version number that appears in the second table. Either of these alternatives **change the version number in one table so that the version number in both tables match**. The third solution involves reversion to a previous version of at least one of the two tables. In other words, if attempting to utilize a newer version creating problems, the older versions that were working properly may be utilized.

Kondo is solely directed to **re-acquisition of a table** if a mismatch in version numbers occurs:

“If the two version numbers are different, or no corresponding version of the current VCT exists in memory, the current VCT is read 112 from the digital tuning subsystem at step 112. The stored VCT is then replaced, or updated, at step 113 with the currently broadcasting VCT.” See Kondo, col. 11, lines 3-8.

By **replacing or updating the VCT**, Kondo is clearly reacquiring a table as opposed to **substituting a version number or reverting to a previous version**. Appellant respectfully submits that the Office Action, citing in part to the passage above, admits that Kondo is reacquiring a table instead of a substitution of version numbers or reversion to a previous version:

“According to at least the three passages quoted above, clearly Kondo et al disclose comparing the VCT table from the broadcasting MGT (see Table 1 in column 9 for illustration of the contents of a MGT), and if a mismatch occurs (new VCT is available), the VCT table in the system is updated by replacement, which is the operation described by (2) above. For that reason, Kondo et al. clearly and sufficiently anticipates the limitation. See Office Action, page 3.

Claim 1 does not recite that a table is updated by replacement as suggested by the Office Action. On the contrary, claim 1 specifically provides solutions to **avoid reacquiring a table**. Kondo does not address the problems of reacquisition discussed above or any solutions that are effective or efficient as provided in claim 1. Kondo actually involves one of the problems discussed above in that it automatically attempts to reacquire a table, which is inefficient. Further, such reacquisition could potentially lead to a failure mode of failure mode from constant reacquisition if the broadcaster made an error in the version numbers. Therefore, Kondo is an example of the problems that claim 1 is solving, not a teaching of claim 1.

Accordingly, Kondo does not teach “wherein said step of ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables includes at least one of the steps of, substituting a version number for said first table version number by substituting in said first table said first table number conveyed in said second table, to ensure compatibility; substituting said version number for said first table version by substituting in said second table said first table number conveyed in said first table, to ensure compatibility; and reverting to a previous version of at least one of (a) said first table, and (b) said second table, to ensure version number compatibility.”

Ensuring Compatability

By reciting “ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch using a forced compatible version number, wherein using said compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table,” claim 1 highlights that the resolution of the mismatch occurs by forcing the compatibility of the version numbers **without reacquiring data for a table**. The Office Action submits that Kondo teaches “wherein using said compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table.” See Office Actions, pages 3-4. The Office Action states that “[f]or example, as disclosed by Kondo et al., the version number of the VCT in the MGT is used or, in other words, forced into that of the VCT in the system before the next piece of new information of either the VCT or MGT from broadcasting is available.” Appellant respectfully submits that even some of the passages cited by the Office Action (e.g., Kondo, col. 9, lines 6-9, 25-28) explain that **new information** is obtained in Kondo in response to a mismatch **prior to compatability**. For example, Kondo explains that “[w]henever the system of the present invention detects a change in the VCT version number, the VCT content has changed and must necessarily be reloaded into memory.” See Kondo col. 9, lines 6-9. Accordingly, Kondo’s approach to attempting to resolve incompatibility is to obtain new information, e.g. the VCT content that has changed. In

contrast, claim 1 resolves the incompatibility, as discussed above, without having to acquire new information. Therefore, Kondo does not teach “ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch using a forced compatible version number, wherein using said compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Appellant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 should be withdrawn. Further, the rejections of claims 4, 6, and 8 should also be withdrawn as these claims depend from claim 1.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 2 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Final Office Action rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of Ozkan. Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 3 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Final Office Action rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of Blatter. Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9 and 11-12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Final Office Action rejected claims 9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of Blatter. With respect to independent claim 9, the Office Action asserts that col. 11, lines 2-10 of Kondo teach “disregarding said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch.” As discussed above with respect to claim 1, this section of Kondo addresses replacing or updating a table. By disregarding the first table version number, both tables are utilized as in their current state. If Kondo taught disregarding the first table version number, Kondo would not teach replacing or updating a table. Therefore, Kondo does not teach “disregarding said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch” as recited by claim 9.

Accordingly, Appellant submits that the rejection of independent claim 9 should be withdrawn. Further, the rejections of claims 11 and 12 should also be withdrawn as these claims depend from claim 9.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Final Office Action rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of Augenbraun. The Office Action admits that Kondo does not teach “removing a channel associated with said fault condition from a User’s viewable active channel line-up list” as recited by claim 1. See Office Action, page 12. The Office Action asserts that Augenbraun provides such a teaching. See Office Action, page 12. In particular, the Office Action refers to col. 5, lines 13-17 of Augenbraun, which states that “[f]inally, it is also possible to customize the channel guide in that the channels that the user rarely access can be removed upon the initial display; this customization is not automatic—direct user interaction with the StarSight system is required.” Augenbraun does not teach that the removal of the channel is associated with a **fault condition**. On the contrary, Augenbraun teaches that a user can directly remove a working channel that is rarely utilized. Accordingly, Appellant submits that the rejection of independent claim 19 should be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Final Office Action rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of Augenbraun and Blatter. Appellant submits that the rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn as this claim depends from claim 19.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Final Office Action rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kondo in view of Augenbraun and Fujimori. Appellant submits that the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn as this claim depends from claim 19.

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

A complete listing of the claims involved in this appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

Appellant does not submit any additional evidence and, therefore, an Appendix B is hereby attached indicating “none.”

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Appellant states that there are no relevant related proceedings and, an Appendix C is hereby attached indicating “none.”

XI. CONCLUSION

The Examiner has not shown in the cited prior art where one may find support for rejections of the pending claims on Appeal. There is simply no disclosure/support pointed out by the Examiner that is even relevant to the features positively recited in claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 19-21. Appellant contends that the rejections are traversed and overcome, in light of the arguments presented above.

The allowance of all claims on Appeal is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 43,613
609-734-6809

Date: May 13, 2010

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

Attachments:

Appendix A: Claims on Appeal
Appendix B: Evidence
Appendix C: Related Proceedings

APPENDIX A

CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The following is a listing of all claims, pending or canceled, incorporating all elements and revisions to date. All non-canceled claims are on appeal, canceled claims being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

1. (previously presented) In a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables, said ancillary information being for use in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display, a method comprising the steps of:

detecting a mismatch between a version number of a first table of said program specific information and a corresponding version number of said first table conveyed in a second table;

ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch using a forced compatible version number, wherein using said compatible version number is forced before acquiring new information corresponding to at least one of: said first table and said second table; and

decoding packetized program information using program specific information including said first and second tables, at least one of said first and second

tables including said forced compatible version number, to provide a video program for display,

wherein said step of ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables includes at least one of the steps of,

substituting a version number for said first table version number by substituting in said first table said first table number conveyed in said second table, to ensure compatibility;

substituting said version number for said first table version by substituting in said second table said first table number conveyed in said first table, to ensure compatibility; and

reverting to a previous version of at least one of (a) said first table, and (b) said second table, to ensure version number compatibility.

2. (original) A method according to claim 1, wherein

said first table comprises a channel map associating a transmission channel carrier frequency with data identifiers used to capture datastreams constituting a program conveyed on a broadcast channel, and

said second table contains information for acquiring program specific information conveyed in other tables including identifiers for identifying data packets comprising said first table.

3. (previously presented) A method according to claim 1, including the step of

examining said program specific information for error indications by examining at least one of, (a) an MPEG transport error indicator, (b) an MPEG discontinuity indicator, (c) an MPEG continuity counter, and

decoding said packetized program information in response to said examination determination of an error free condition.

4. (original) A method according to claim 1, wherein
said second table conveys a plurality of version numbers corresponding to version numbers conveyed in said plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables, and said detecting step includes the step of,

comparing individual version numbers of said plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables against corresponding individual version numbers conveyed in said second table.

5. (cancelled)

6. (previously presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein
said substituting step comprises overwriting said first table version number conveyed in at least one of (a) said first table, and (b) said second table, to ensure compatibility.

7. (cancelled)

8. (previously presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein

said step of ensuring compatibility of said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables includes the step of,

acquiring at least one of (a) a new version of said first table, and (b) a new version of said second table, to ensure version number compatibility after said forcing operation is performed.

9. (previously presented) In a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables, said ancillary information being for use in acquiring and decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display, a method comprising the steps of:

detecting a mismatch between a version number of a first table of said program specific information and a corresponding version number of said first table conveyed in a second table;

decoding packetized program information by,

disregarding said first table version number conveyed in said first and second tables in response to said detected mismatch and by

applying program specific information including information in said first table;

examining said program specific information for an error condition in addition to said detected mismatch; and

decoding said packetized program information in response to the absence of an error condition when the mismatch is the only detected error condition.

10. (cancelled)

11. (previously presented) A method according to claim 9, wherein

said error condition is indicated by at least one of, (a) an MPEG transport error indicator, (b) an MPEG discontinuity indicator, (c) an MPEG continuity counter.

12. (original) A method according to claim 9, wherein

said second table conveys a plurality of version numbers corresponding to version numbers conveyed in said plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables, and said detecting step includes the step of,

comparing individual version numbers of said plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables against corresponding individual version numbers conveyed in said second table.

Claims 13-18 (cancelled)

19. (original) In a system for decoding packetized program information including ancillary program specific information comprising a plurality of hierarchically ordered information tables, said ancillary information being for use in acquiring and

decoding packetized program information to provide a video program for display, a method comprising the steps of:

detecting a fault condition in program specific information comprising at least one of, (a) a version number incompatibility between a version number of a first table and a corresponding version number of said first table conveyed in a second table, and (b) a PSI error condition;

indicating in a database said transmission channel is associated with said detected fault condition; and

removing a channel associated with said fault condition from a User's viewable active channel line-up list.

20. (original) A method according to claim 19, wherein

said PSI error condition comprises at least one of, (a) an MPEG transport error, (b) an MPEG discontinuity error, (c) an MPEG continuity count error, and (d) an error indicated by a variance between successive time stamps.

21. (original) A method according to claim 19, including the step of indicating a channel as being associated with a fault condition in a User's viewable channel line-up list.

Serial No. 10/030,797
RCA89615

PATENT
Customer No. 24498

APPENDIX B

EVIDENCE

None.

Serial No. 10/030,797
RCA89615

PATENT
Customer No. 24498

APPENDIX C

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

None.